



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARE PAUL'S PRISON LETTERS FROM EPHEBUS? (Concluded)

CLAYTON R. BOWEN
Meadville Theological School, Meadville, Pennsylvania

Lightfoot and others, against all probability, have tried to place Philippians very early in the Roman imprisonment, prior to the other prison letters, and with as great an interval as possible between it and them, because of apparent affinities of thought and expression between it and the great letters of the earlier group (Galatians, I and II Corinthians, Romans), and of apparent divergencies between it and the Colossians-"Ephesians" group. The latter divergencies disappear with the realization that "Ephesians" is pseudo-Pauline, and that the text of Colossians, chapters 1 and 2, has undergone revision and interpolation since Paul wrote it.¹ But the affinities with the great letters are really more notable than Lightfoot realized and are of very great suggestiveness. This paper can make only brief reference to some of the more obvious parallels.

In Col. 2:8 and 2:20 the allusions to *στοιχεῖα* offer a close parallel to Gal. 4:3, 8-10, and that whether the Colossians passages are thought to be written by Paul or not. If not, the interpolator of Colossians at this point took his cue from the Galatians passages. Col. 2:11-13 is a close reproduction of Rom. 6:3-11, Paul's only other allusion to baptism as a being buried with Christ. The insertion into this figure of the figure of circumcision which is *ἀχειροποίητος* (i.e., not literal but spiritual) suggests Rom. 2:28 f and the polemic against the demand for circumcision in Galatians, chapters 5 and 6 (cf. also Gal. 2:3, 12; 3:3). If Col. 2:15 be written by Paul, he refers to the giving of the law by angels (Gal. 3:19); the abolition of the law is a triumph over its promulgators. If the words are due to an interpolator, he still has in mind Paul's

¹ The present writer regards it as highly probable that all the allusions to the heresy in Col., chaps. 1 and 2, and all the exalted Christology which is set in definite contrast to the heresy, do not belong to Paul's original letter.

suggestion as to the *provenance* of the law, spoken by the apostle in Gal. 3:19 only. Col. 2:16 (again, whether Paul's wording or not) is Gal. 4:10. The whole point is set forth at length in Romans, chapter 14; cf. especially verses 5 f. Col. 2:20 f. again owes much to Romans, chapter 14. Col. 2:19 introduces the figure of the body (as does 3:5, briefly) which Paul uses at greater length in I Cor. 12:12-27; Rom. 12:4 f. Ἐπιχορηγέω, used in this verse, is used by Paul again only in Gal. 3:5; II Cor. 9:10. The "catalogue of vices" in Col. 3:5-9a has parallels in Paul in Galatians (5:19-21), I Corinthians (5:10 f.; 6:9 f.), II Corinthians (12:20 f.), and Romans (1:29-31; 13:13). Compare Col. 3:7 with I Cor. 6:11. Εἰδωλολατρεία Paul uses only here, in Gal. 5:20 and I Cor. 10:14; νεκρόω only in Col. 3:5 and Rom. 4:9; with this word cf. Rom. 6:6; 8:13; Gal. 5:24. Col. 3:9 f. is Rom. 6:5-8; ἀνακαινώνω occurs only here and in II Cor. 4:16; κατ'εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν is Rom. 8:29. Col. 3:11 is Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:12 is Rom. 13:14. Col. 3:11-14 is repeated in reverse order, in Gal. 3:27 f. Col. 3:16 refers to the charismatic utterances in the Christian meeting, dwelt on at length in I Corinthians, chapters 12-14 (cf. especially 12:8; 14:2 f., 15, 26, 28), and Rom. 12:3-8. Col. 3:22 is Gal. 3:28; I Cor. 7:17-24; 12:13. The word "men-pleasers" in Col. 3:22 recalls a similar contrast between pleasing men and being a δοῦλος Χριστοῦ in Gal. 1:10. In this verse occurs the word ἀπλότης, used by Paul only here and in Romans and II Corinthians. Col. 3:23 f. is Gal. 3:28-4:7; Rom. 8:15-17. Col. 4:1b is I Cor. 7:22a; προσωποληψία in 3:25 Paul uses again only in Rom. 2:11; ἰσότης in 4:1 again only in II Cor. 8:13 f. Col. 4:2 (τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε) is repeated in Rom. 12:2 (τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες). "A door for the word" in Col. 4:3 uses the figure of I Cor. 16:9; II Cor. 2:12; "mystery of Christ" is a concept of I Cor. 2:1 (μαρτύριον v.l.); 4:1; Rom. 11:25. Col. 4:5 advises the recent converts as to their procedure with reference to pagan neighbors and outsiders generally; similar advice is found in I Cor. 5:12 f.; 6:1-6; 10:29-32. The word ἐξαγοράζομαι is used only here (repeated in Eph. 5:16) and in Gal. 3:13; 4:5.

Even more parallels of thought and expression may be observed between Philippians and the four great letters, and many exegetical

observations serve to connect this letter with the Ephesian period, some of which may be set down. The word *ἐπισκοπος* in Phil. 1:1 has always excited comment; it is to be observed that the only other church in connection with which Paul is recorded to have used the term is the church of *Ephesus* (Acts 20:28). The reference to the many Christian preachers, some of whom mingle with their preaching unworthy motives of spite and jealousy toward each other and even toward Paul, fits very well our knowledge of the situation in Ephesus; that there was a similar situation in Rome we can only infer in case this letter comes from Rome. The church in Ephesus was not really founded by Paul (Acts 18:18-21), though he preached there once at the beginning of the movement; the church was well established by others during his absence, and he came back to find it in full course (Acts 19:1). "All that dwelt in Asia heard the word" (19:10) from his helpers, some of whom are named: there are Prisca and Aquila (18:19, 26), Timothy and Erastus (19:22), Gaius and Aristarchus (19:29). Moreover, Romans, chapter 16, which assuredly is addressed to Ephesus, mentions an astonishing number of preachers and workers there, male and female. These are mostly greeted with warm affection, but there are some (16:17 f.) "that are causing divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the teaching" which the Ephesians had learned from Paul. This was written after leaving Ephesus, and the *φθόνος* and *ἔρις* of these teachers have become more dangerous. We can trace the development of this pernicious tendency in Ephesus in clearly marked stages. After Rom. 16:17 f. we have Paul's comment to the Ephesian elders at Miletus a few weeks or months later: "From among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them" (Acts 20:30). So accurate is this forecast that II Tim. 1:15 (whether Paul's wording or not) announces sadly: "All that are in Asia turned away from me." Last of all, the message to Ephesus in Rev. 2:1-7, with its reference to evil men who call themselves apostles and are not, but are false, with the accusation, "thou didst leave thy first love" and its exhortation, "remember whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works," completes the process begun in strife and envy when Paul was in bonds for the gospel.

An independent and long-standing church like that in Rome would not so naturally be stirred into new preaching zeal because Paul was brought from Caesarea under guard to await the issue of his appeal.

Phil. 1:19 has the noun *ἐπιχορηγία*, which occurs again only in Eph. 4:16, there probably suggested by the cognate verb in Col. 2:19. The verb occurs also in Gal. 3:5; II Cor. 9:10. *ἀποκαραδοκία* (1:20) occurs again only in Rom. 8:19. In 1:26 we have the noun *καύχημα*, which with its cognates is a favorite expression of Paul's. The verb *καυχάομαι* is found in the New Testament only in the Pauline letters and twice in James. Galatians, I and II Corinthians, and Romans have it thirty times; Philippians has it once and Ephesians once. Moule remarks that its frequent use in Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans is "a fact bearing on the date of this epistle" (Philippians).¹ If so, it would support the Ephesian hypothesis. *καύχημα*, similarly, occurs eight times in Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, twice in Philippians, and only once more in the New Testament (Heb. 3:6). *καύχησις*, also, occurs nine times in I and II Corinthians and Romans, and only once more in the New Testament (Jas. 4:16). Phil. 1:28 speaks of the *ἀντικείμενοι* in Philippi as I Cor. 16:9 speaks of the *ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί* in Ephesus. In both cases the gentile (not Jewish nor Jewish-Christian) foes of the gospel are meant, such persons as attacked the first Christian propaganda in Philippi (Acts 16:19-22) and are still keeping up the attack, as Paul indicates by *ἔξωθεν μάχαι* (II Cor. 7:5), words written at Philippi shortly after leaving Ephesus. Phil. 1:30 continues the reference to the persecution in Philippi; the Christians there have the same struggle which they witnessed in Paul's case when he was founding their church (Acts, chap. 16) and now hear of in his case (at Ephesus or Rome), namely, abuse and imprisonment. Phil. 1:28, 30 is best understood of a time not too far removed from Paul's first preaching in Philippi, and roughly contemporary with the *μάχαι* in Philippi of II Cor. 7:5. *ἐνδείξις* in 1:28 is found only here, II Cor. 8:24; Rom. 3:25 f., and *ἐνδείκνυμι* in Paul only (II Cor. 8:24; Rom. 2:15; 9:17, 22). The whole passage (1:12-30) shows clearly that Paul is facing the

¹ H. C. G. Moule, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (Cambridge Greek Testament [1897]), ad 1:26.

prospect of death, though for his friends' sake he puts the most hopeful construction on the situation. In other words, it fits exactly the Ephesian experience of II Cor. 1:8-11.

In Phil. 2:1 παραμύθιον is *harax legomenon*, but παραμυθία is found in I Cor. 14:3. So in 2:2 κενοδοξία is *harax legomenon*, but Gal. 5:26 has κενოდόξοι. The Christology of 2:6 f. may be illustrated by II Cor. 3:17; 4:4; 5:21; 8:9; Gal. 4:4 f.; Rom. 8:3, 29; 15:2 f., 5; and 2:10 f. echoes Rom. 15:6 as 2:11b echoes I Cor. 15:28. μὲρφη in 2:5 is not used again by Paul, but cognates are found (besides in Phil. 3:10 and 21) in Gal. 4:9; II Cor. 3:18; Rom. 12:2. κενῶ (2:7) occurs again in Paul (I Cor. 1:17; 9:15; II Cor. 9:3; Rom. 4:14). ὁμῳίωμα (Phil. 2:7) is used again by Paul only in Romans. Phil. 2:9 has its equivalent in Rom. 8:34, and Phil. 2:10 f. is closely paralleled in Rom. 14:9 and 11, also in I Cor. 15:25. "Fear and trembling" (2:12) occurs in Paul again (I Cor. 2:3; II Cor. 7:15). In Phil. 2:16 ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα simply unites two phrases found separately in Galatians (2:2 and 4:11). Phil. 2:21 criticizes certain Christians in Paul's environment who go their way following their own interests, not Christ's. The language fits exactly the preachers with mixed motives in 1:15-17 and the situation in Ephesus as we know it. Phil. 2:25 uses ἀπόστολος in the sense of "delegate," as does II Cor. 8:23.

The sudden break at Phil. 3:2 is probably due to some interruption.¹ Jones has plausibly suggested that Paul hears just here of some specially hostile act of the Jews against him, perhaps the arrival in Rome of the witnesses sent by the Sanhedrin from Jerusalem, to testify against him before Caesar. Such news might indeed cause him to flame out in sharp words. But had Paul heard of the arrival of this hostile deputation he would quite certainly have mentioned the fact to the Philippians, who were so anxious to know the latest concerning his affair. The coming of these people would be a most important factor in the development of Paul's case, might even hasten it to an issue. Especially if he were writing from distant Rome would he give all the information at his disposal,

¹ So Lightfoot, Jones, and many commentators.

since another letter could not reach them for six weeks. Doubtless the interruption is due to news of the activity of these *κύνες*, but not in Philippi (there is no indication that they were at work there), nor yet necessarily in the place where Paul is confined. There is no suggestion that they are the persons who are persecuting Paul and responsible for his imprisonment; his warning against them is not on personal grounds. Their wrongdoing is wrong teaching, as the contrast in verse 3 makes absolutely certain; they are the Judaists, and the report which is responsible for the burst of sharp words at Phil. 3:2 is most probably the news of their nefarious work in Galatia. The letter to the Galatians may have been written between Phil. 3:1 and 3:2. Less probably the disturbing news is that of Judaistic machinations in Corinthians (II Cor. 11:18-23). We can now account for the extraordinary number of parallels between Philippians on the one hand and Galatians and II Corinthians on the other. The opinion of commentators is divided on the question whether these *κύνες* are Jews or Judaists. If they were Jews they might fit the Roman hypothesis of the letter's origin, since the Jews were responsible for the arrest and imprisonment that brought him to Rome; cf. Acts 20:3 and the whole story of Jewish hostility from that point till the end. But, as already pointed out, these men are not described as Paul's persecutors at all but as false teachers, and the language of verses 7-10, as well as the parallels in Galatians and I and II Corinthians, make it certain that they were Judaists. We know of no continued Judaistic activity as late as the Roman period; that crisis had its culmination in the Ephesian period, to which Philippians assuredly belongs, if only for the likeness of 3:2-21 to Galatians. The Judaists are called here in Philippians *κύνες, κακοὶ ἐργάται, ἡ κατατομή*. II Cor. 11:13 calls the same people, for the same activities, *δόλιοι ἐργάται*, and Gal. 5:2-12 is a fuller reaction on the demand for circumcision which calls out the savage epithet *κατατομή*; this word itself has its illuminating parallel in the even sharper expression *ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται* (Gal. 5:12). The fruitful idea of the Christians as the true Israel (3:2), inheritors of all the promises and prerogatives of Judaism, is found in I Cor. 10:18; Gal. 3:7-14; 4:21-31; 6:16; and Romans, *passim*. Phil. 3:5, as already pointed out, is II Cor. 11:18-23,

written of the same Judaists, and Phil. 3:6 is precisely Gal. 1:13 f. Phil. 3:7 f. is Gal. 6:14, while Phil. 3:10 f. has close parallels in Rom. 6:4-11; II Cor. 1:5; 4:10 f.; Gal. 2:20; 6:14. The figure of the race in 3:12-14 has its parallels in I Cor. 9:24-27 (*βραβεῖον* only Phil. 3:14 and I Cor. 9:24); Gal. 5:7 (Gal. 2:2; Rom. 9:16), and in words spoken by Paul to the elders of Ephesus, *ὡς τελειώσω τὸν δρόμον μου* (Acts 20:24). *τέλειος* of Phil. 3:15 and *τετελείωμαι* of 3:12 are explained by I Cor. 2:6 and 3:1, and Phil. 3:16 is Gal. 6:16. The injunction of Phil. 3:17, *συνμιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε*, is found again in I Cor. 4:16 and 11:1, as well as in Acts 20:35 (to the Ephesian elders), *πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.* Of the Judaists Paul speaks *κλαίων* (Phil. 3:18); his tears are due, not to any evil these persons are doing in Philippi, nor primarily to their hostility to his own person, but to the havoc they are working in certain of his churches. The Galatian episode gives the precise explanation, and the Galatian letter was surely written *διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων*, as the "sorrowful letter" to Corinth was, about the same period (II Cor. 2:4), which flamed into such bitter wrath against these same Judaists at work in Corinth (II Cor. 10:12-18; 11:12-15, 21 f.). The tears of II Corinthians and of Philippians are contemporary and due to the same cause. "Enemies of the cross of Christ" (Phil. 3:18) has its commentary in Gal. 2:21, and Phil. 3:18-21 has its close parallel in Gal. 6:12-14. The Judaists' glory is in their *αἰσχύνῃ* (*pudenda*), they glory in the flesh, while Paul glories in the cross (Gal. 3:13 f.), of which they are the enemies. Rom. 16:18 has the language of Phil. 3:19 (*δουλεύουσιν τῇ ἐαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ* = *ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία*), but probably not applied to the Judaists. So Rom. 16:17 is parallel to Phil. 3:17, with its injunction to *σκοπεῖν* those who do not walk according to the teaching and example received from Paul. Phil. 3:21 is explained by the parallels in I Cor. 15:27 f., 50-53. The tactful expressions of gratitude for the Philippians' gift in 4:10-20 recall Paul's insistence in I Cor. 9; II Cor. 11:7-12; 12:13, that he would not accept financial support from his churches, *with the exception of Philippi* (II Cor. 11:9), and the situation of poverty and distress relieved by the Philippians' gift is well pictured in the words in which Paul describes his situation during the Ephesian period in Acts 20:33-35. The sacrificial

metaphor of Phil. 4:18 suggests the λογική λατρεία of Romans, chapter 12, the living sacrifice of your bodies, which is τῷ θεῷ εὐαρεστών. The whole of Romans, chapter 12, is just an explication in detail of the λογική λατρεία, and has many parallels of phrasing and of thought to Philippians. It may be submitted that the extraordinary number of points of contact in thought and phrase (often very close) between the prison letters and the utterances of Paul during the Ephesian period and just after cannot be adequately explained, save by referring to the prison letters to the same period as the others, especially since no valid argument can be offered for dating them years later in Rome.

It may be inquired whether the Ephesian imprisonment, granting that it took place, was long enough to allow for the composition of the letters in question. Since Colossians and Philemon are written at the same time, we have to account only for an interval between Colossians and Philippians, and here, on any hypothesis, we are left entirely to inference. Nothing in the letters themselves demands an extended imprisonment; in fact, if Paul were arrested at all as a result of hostility in Ephesus, the probability is that he would be either condemned or freed within a short time. Granting the Ephesian imprisonment, we simply do not know how long it lasted, or how soon after the letters to Colossae that the letter to Philippi was sent. The only reason why the prison letters have generally been supposed to be spread out over a considerable time is that the Roman imprisonment allowed two years or more during which their composition might fall.

Finally, it ought to be pointed out that we definitely know that Paul expected death in Ephesus (II Cor. 1:8-10; Rom. 16:3 f.), as he says in absolutely plain words; whereas, although it is likely that Paul perished in the Neronian massacre of Christians in Rome in the year 64, it is altogether unlikely that he could expect the result of his process in Rome to be his execution. In other words, the expectation of death expressed in Philippians is strong presumptive evidence against Rome and for Ephesus. Paul had appealed to Caesar, but there is not the faintest reason to suppose that Caesar, on hearing the case, would condemn him to death. Let us be reminded again that Rome had no interest in punishing Paul,

had made no charge against him, indeed, had not arrested him, least of all on the ground of any crime against the Roman state. A Roman officer had rescued him from a Jewish mob that was trying to kill him, and to save him from assassination by his Jewish enemies had sent him for safe-keeping to the custody of the governor at Caesarea. From that custody, for various reasons, he was not released, until, in despair of regaining his liberty to resume work, he appealed to Caesar, obviously and naturally expecting that when Caesar heard the case he would be set free. If one attentively reads Acts 21:27 to the end of the book, one will see clearly that Rome has no hostility whatever to Paul, no concern in his imprisonment, and of its own initiative would never have arrested him, still less have put him to death. It is most unlikely that if the Sanhedrists had sent delegates to Rome to argue against Paul before Nero (and there is not the slightest evidence that they did so), the Emperor would have regarded their complaints as sufficient to justify condemnation. What would have happened is precisely illustrated by Gallio's comment when the Jews dragged Paul before his judgment seat, with the same complaint which the Jerusalem Jews made (Acts 21:28) and the only complaint they could have made before Caesar: "This man persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the Law." Caesar would have answered as Gallio did: "If indeed it were a matter of wrong or of wicked villainy, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you; but if they are questions about words and names and your own law, look to it yourselves; I am not minded to be a judge of these matters," and, like Gallio, would have driven them from the judgment seat, caring for none of these things (Acts 18:14-17). Read Acts 21:31-40; 22:23-30; note the friendliness of the chiliarch Claudius Lysias in 23:22-24 and his careful explanation in the letter to Felix (23:26-30), the friendliness also of Felix in 23:35; 24:22 f. Read Festus' words to Agrippa (25:14-21, 24-27) and the judgment of 26:31 f.: "This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds . . . he might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed to Caesar." Is Caesar himself likely to have a contrary verdict? It is certain that the letter of Festus to Caesar (25:26 f.) would put a favorable construction on Paul's case. So

the officer in charge of Paul on the journey treats him with respect and kindness (27:3, 43) and in Rome he has every consideration (28:16, 30 f.). No one can read this account, with its optimistic, almost triumphant close, where the apostle, living in his own dwelling, receives all that come to him, preaching the Kingdom of God and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, no one hindering him—no one can read all this and believe that the natural sequence is the prospect of condemnation and death revealed in Philippians. Wherever, whenever, we place the situation out of which Philippians is written, it cannot be the issue of Paul's appeal to Caesar. And no one would ever have supposed it to be so, except for the supposition that letters written "in bonds" must be written in Rome. If the Sanhedrists had been going to send witnesses to plead against Paul in Rome, they would not have waited two whole years to do so, nor would a case so old as that have much consideration. Paul's situation in Philippians is one of immediate danger, a great *thalipsis*, where death seems imminent. By every consideration of probability it must be assigned to some other occasion than Paul's detention in Rome, awaiting decision on his appeal. And that other occasion is almost certainly the *thalipsis* that befell him in Asia.

This article does not pretend to make an original contribution to the discussion of the place of origin of the prison letters, but is concerned only to bring together the data contributed by the scholars listed below. To prevent multiplication of references, their names have seldom been cited in the course of the article, but its positions are mainly taken from one or another of the contributions summarized.

For the Ephesian hypothesis:

- H. Lisco, *Vincula Sanctorum* (1900); *Roma Peregrina* (1901). (The four prison letters and original form of Past. from Ephesus.)
- A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (1908), pp. 165 f. (2d ed. 1909), pp. 171 f. English translation *Light from the Ancient East* (1910), pp. 229 f. (At least Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians from Ephesus. Deissmann had taught this view as early as 1897.)
- M. Albertz, "Über die Abfassung des Philipperbriefes des Paulus zu Ephesus," *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* (1910), pp. 551 ff. (Philippians from Ephesus, but Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians from Rome or possibly Caesarea.)

- B. W. Robinson, "An Ephesian Imprisonment of Paul," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXIX (1910), 181-89. (Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and probably Philippians from Ephesus.)
- Westberg, *Zur Neutestamentliche Chronologie* (1911).
- M. Dibelius, *An die Philippper* (1911), *An die Kolosser* (1912), *Handbuch zum N.T.* (Vol. III, Part II), comments on Phil. 1:13 and Col. 4:13. (Favors Colossians, Philemon, Philippians from Ephesus without making definite decision. Ephesians not considered Paul's.)
- M. Goguel, "La date et le lieu de composition de l'épître aux Philippiens," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (November-December 1912), pp. 330-42. (Philippians from Ephesus; the others apparently from Rome.)
- P. Feine, *Einleitung in das N.T.* (1913), pp. 50-53, 58, 65 f. (Philippians from Ephesus; Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians from Caesarea.)
- K. Lake, "Critical Problems of the Epistle to the Philippians," *Expositor* (June, 1914), pp. 489-93. (As Albertz.)
- B. W. Bacon, "Again the Ephesian Imprisonment of Paul," *Expositor* (March, 1915), pp. 235-42. (The letters not assigned.)
- E. W. Winstanley, "Pauline Letters from an Ephesian Prison," *Expositor* (June, 1915), pp. 481-98. (Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and probably Philippians from Ephesus.)

Against the Ephesian hypothesis:

- E. Haupt, *Die Gefangenschaftsbriege* (Meyer, ed. 6/7, 1902), *Einleitung*, p. 82, n. 1. (Briefly rejects Lisco's theory.)
- Gerard Ball: "The Epistle to the Philippians: A Reply [to Lake]," *Expositor* (August, 1914), pp. 143-47. (Against Ephesian origin of Philippians.)
- Maurice Jones, "The Epistles of the Captivity: Where Were They Written?" *Expositor* (October, 1915), and "The Epistle to the Philippians," *Westminster Commentaries* (1918), pp. xxv-xxxv. (The fullest discussion; all the prison letters from Rome, but Philippians could come from Ephesus more easily than the others.)
- J. Moffatt, *Introduction to the New Testament* (3d ed., 1918), Appendix C. (Colossians, Philemon, Philippians from Rome, Ephesians not Paul's.)
- Reviews of Lisco's *Vincula Sanctorum*, by Arnold Meyer in the *Theologischer Jahresbericht* (1900), p. 267, and by Carl Clemen in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1900), cols. 631 f., reject his theory. Lisco's view seems to be so complicated by fantastic detail as not easily to be judged on its own merits.
- Max Krenkel, *Beiträge zur Aufhellung der Geschichte und der Briefe des Apostel Paulus* (2d ed., 1895), p. 148, and J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, Part I (1914), pp. 242-44, argue for an imprisonment of Paul in Ephesus, apart from assignment of letters to this period.

These are all the discussions of the matter known to the present writer, though there are surely others. Lisco and Westberg have not been seen, the reference to Westberg being taken from Moffatt (*loc. cit.*) Goguel (p. 332) reports that Harnack, lecturing in 1912, while not adopting the Ephesian hypothesis, admitted that he had no decisive argument against it.